

CA20N
H86
-83W54

GOVT

Government
Publications

5

PN
6

W54

ONTARIO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY STATISTICS

*and Their Implications for
Drug Education Programming*

Simmie C. Magid & Michael S. Goodstadt



Education Research Section
ADDICTION RESEARCH FOUNDATION



ONTARIO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY STATISTICS
AND THEIR
IMPLICATIONS FOR DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMMING



Department of Research Section
Library of the University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada

ONTARIO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY STATISTICS

AND THEIR

IMPLICATIONS FOR DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMMING

Simmie C. Magid

&

Michael S. Goodstadt

Education Research Section
Addiction Research Foundation
Toronto, Canada

The views expressed and positions taken in this working paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views or positions of the Addiction Research Foundation.

No part of this working paper may be reproduced in any form--except for a brief quotation (not to exceed 1,000 words) in a review or professional work--without permission in writing from the publisher.

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Magid, Simmie C. (Simmie Claire), 1947-
Ontario juvenile delinquency statistics and their implications for drug education programming

(Working paper series, ISSN 0708-5133)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-88868-079-1

1. Juvenile delinquency - Ontario - Statistics.
 2. Juvenile delinquents - Ontario - Drug use - Statistics.
 3. Drug abuse and crime - Ontario - Statistics.
 4. Drug abuse - Study and teaching. - Ontario.
- I. Goodstadt, Michael S., 1940-
II. Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario.
Education Research Section. III. Title. IV. Series: Working paper Series (Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario).

HV9109-06M33

364.3'6'09713


C82-098432-1

Copyright © 1983 by the Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation, Toronto. All rights reserved.

Printed and bound in Canada.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the following people for promptly, capably and patiently answering special requests for information, providing unpublished data and otherwise helping to produce this report: Robert Allen, Karen Maser and Shelagh Sloan of Statistics Canada's Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics; Marvin Rotter, Nancy Anderson and Jean Linton of the Information Centre, Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services; Dorothy Gonsalves-Singh, Information and Computer Systems Branch Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General; Rich Partridge and Tony Barclay, Probation and Aftercare Services, Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services; and Bob Harris of the Ontario Provincial Secretariat for Justice.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/39192409100088>

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents statistics on detected and reported juvenile delinquency in Ontario. Data cover the years 1978 to 1981.

The Juvenile Delinquents Act (Revised Statutes of Canada 1970, Chapter J-3) defines a juvenile delinquent as:

"any child who violates any provision of the Criminal Code or of any federal or provincial statute, or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality, or who is guilty of sexual immorality or any similar form of vice, or who is liable by reason of any other act to be committed to an industrial school or juvenile reformatory under any federal or provincial statute."

In Ontario, the act applies to children from seven through 15 years of age.

Juvenile delinquents are potentially a prime target for preventive educational programs on drugs, including alcohol. Studies have consistently shown a statistical association between delinquency and drug use. Moreover, the widely held belief that the relationship between delinquency and drug use is spurious, that is, that it is produced by factors antecedent to and causally related to both, has recently been questioned. And, as Clayton points out:

" ... the implications of the finding that the delinquency-drug use relationship may be causal instead of spurious extend far beyond the empirical finding. Assume that the relationship, at least among 'normal' adolescents, is causal. With such an assumption, it may be possible to devise efficacious early detection and drug education/prevention programs that fall much closer to the primary than the secondary and tertiary end of the prevention continuum."*

Routinely collected statistics provide little opportunity to explore the relationship between drug use and crime among juveniles, except where juveniles are apprehended for drug and alcohol-related offences.

A study by the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services[†] sheds some light on the relationship. The study examined 249 persistent male recidivists in their early 20s, incarcerated in provincial correctional centres. Of 209 interviewees who gave reasons for taking part in illegal activities when they were juveniles, 54.5% mentioned the influence of drugs/alcohol and 34.4% mentioned money for drugs/alcohol. The influence

* Richard R. Clayton, "The delinquency and drug use relationship among adolescents: A critical review," in Dan J. Lettieri and Jacqueline P. Ludford (Eds.), Drug abuse and the American Adolescent, National Institute on Drug Abuse Research Monograph 38. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

[†] Marian L. Polonoski, Chronic young offenders, Project 174, Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, Planning and Research Branch, November, 1980.

of drugs/alcohol was the second most frequently mentioned reason for involvement in illicit activities as a juvenile -- the most frequently mentioned was thrills/excitement/something to do (64.1%).

The study concluded that the single most important reason for young adult recidivists' involvement in crime was drug and alcohol use. The author added:

"Yet, while they had an increasingly great need for drug/alcohol treatment, they had a decreasing enthusiasm for entering programmes related to it in the institutions. This programme was sought by these recidivists more while they were younger offenders and they did not tend to continue it in their later years. Perhaps a more comprehensive, long-term treatment programme, initiated early in the chronic offender's career and maintained in subsequent incarcerations should be encouraged. Such a programme must undoubtedly have an impact on the rate of recidivism of these chronic offenders."

Most of the young adult recidivists in the Correctional Services Ministry's study began their criminal careers as juveniles. Of 185 interviewees, 161 (87.0%) reported that they committed their first minor offence before the age of 16, and of 159 interviewees, 77 (48.4%) reported that they committed their first serious offence as a juvenile. Of 207, 135 (65.2%) were first in court before they were 16; of 209, 100 (47.8%) were

first on probation as juveniles; and 91 of 209 (43.5%) had been to training school.

Although there is clearly a need to explore further the relationship between drug and alcohol use and criminality among juveniles, young people in trouble with the law would seem to be an obvious target, in themselves, for educational programs on substance use and abuse. Research and the development of programs designed for this population should also assist in developing effective programs for the "at risk" segments of the school population -- those who have already encountered problems with the authorities (in Ontario, more than 65,000 a year including repeaters, as we shall see later), and those whose behaviors, including drug use, are likely to result in increasing confrontations with the justice system.

The questions arise: How many such juveniles are there? Where can they be found? How long will they be there? Where will they go next? The tables that follow are presented with the aim of finding answers to these questions, to the extent they are answerable by available statistics.

Such an approach is limited. Statistics are based only on recorded information. Important variables may not be recorded. Reports may be inaccurate or incomplete. Different patterns in different areas may be obscured in the calculation of province-wide averages. But statistics should provide a broad picture of the operation of the juvenile justice system and point to the best places for educational interventions.

CHAPTER 1:

POLICE STATISTICS

TABLE 1

Number of Juveniles Apprehended by the Police by Type of Offence, 1978-81.

MOST SERIOUS OFFENCE ¹	NUMBER OF JUVENILES APPREHENDED ²			
	1978	1979	1980	1981
Homicide, attempted murder	8	10	2	6
Sexual offences	350	402	382	447
Assaults (not indecent)	2,969	3,094	3,303	3,313
Robbery	268	284	369	311
TOTAL CRIMES OF VIOLENCE	3,595	3,790	4,056	4,077
Break and enter	7,992	7,894	8,342	7,620
Motor vehicle theft	2,486	2,335	2,178	1,798
Theft over \$200	785	898	1,106	1,303
Shoplifting (under \$200)	12,689	12,317	12,046	14,224
Other theft under \$200	7,515	7,953	8,189	8,162
Have stolen goods	1,506	1,584	1,642	1,759
Frauds	599	646	689	673
TOTAL PROPERTY CRIMES	33,572	33,627	34,192	35,539
Offensive weapons	663	635	768	835
Arson	709	669	633	578
Disturb the peace	2,745	2,892	2,072	2,469
Trespass at night	568	678	641	720
Wilful damage (private)	5,993	5,735	5,221	5,357
Wilful damage (public)	1,404	1,377	1,582	1,718
Other Criminal Code	2,485	2,499	2,591	2,606
TOTAL OTHER CRIMES	14,567	14,485	13,508	14,283
TOTAL CRIMINAL CODE	51,734	51,902	51,756	53,899
Cannabis possession	1,092	1,259	1,379	1,050
Cannabis trafficking	61	88	89	75
Cannabis - other ³	3	4	3	0
Heroin	0	0	1	1
Cocaine	1	1	4	3
Other NCA drugs ⁴	18	14	12	51
Food and Drugs Act ⁵	26	30	41	34
TOTAL DRUG STATUTES	1,201	1,396	1,529	1,214
Juvenile Delinquents Act ⁶	1,155	1,103	1,175	1,071
Other federal statutes	887	1,014	514	447
TOTAL FEDERAL STATUTES	3,243	3,513	3,218	2,732
Liquor statutes ⁷	3,503	3,308	3,177	3,250
Other provincial statutes	8,099	6,871	6,360	5,914
TOTAL PROVINCIAL STATUTES	11,602	10,179	9,537	9,164
MUNICIPAL BY-LAWS	767	755	680	811
ONTARIO GRAND TOTAL ⁸	67,346	66,349	65,191	66,606

Source. Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Crime and Traffic Enforcement Statistics, 1978-80. 1981 data, provided by the Centre's Law Enforcement program, are preliminary and subject to revision.

TABLE 2

Number of Juveniles Charged by the Police by Type of Offence, 1978-81

MOST SERIOUS OFFENCE ¹	NUMBER OF JUVENILES CHARGED ⁹			
	1978	1979	1980	1981
Homicide, attempted murder	7	10	2	5
Sexual offences	118	154	168	142
Assaults (not indecent)	768	823	817	851
Robbery	222	234	306	229
TOTAL CRIMES OF VIOLENCE	1,115	1,221	1,293	1,227
Break and enter	5,197	4,930	5,540	4,803
Motor vehicle theft	1,692	1,549	1,467	1,196
Theft over \$200	501	573	695	786
Shoplifting (under \$200)	2,588	2,629	2,696	3,148
Other theft under \$200	2,581	2,588	2,787	2,795
Have stolen goods	958	881	911	914
Frauds	223	217	239	290
TOTAL PROPERTY CRIMES	13,740	13,367	14,335	13,932
Offensive weapons	228	223	263	276
Arson	97	120	146	94
Disturb the peace	131	94	98	76
Trespass at night	34	49	26	38
Wilful damage (private)	1,000	947	1,003	951
Wilful damage (public)	378	376	427	417
Other Criminal Code	795	663	692	654
TOTAL OTHER CRIMES	2,663	2,472	2,655	2,506
TOTAL CRIMINAL CODE	17,518	17,060	18,283	17,665
Cannabis possession	436	480	599	479
Cannabis trafficking	51	58	76	59
Cannabis - other ³	2	3	2	0
Heroin	0	0	1	1
Cocaine	1	0	4	3
Other NCA drugs ⁴	1	9	4	7
Food and Drugs Act ⁵	16	23	29	17
TOTAL DRUG STATUTES	507	573	715	566
Juvenile Delinquents Act ⁶	550	383	354	331
Other federal statutes	130	103	67	87
TOTAL FEDERAL STATUTES	1,187	1,059	1,136	984
Liquor statutes ⁷	1,736	1,438	1,363	1,233
Other provincial statutes	345	394	380	448
TOTAL PROVINCIAL STATUTES	2,081	1,832	1,743	1,681
MUNICIPAL BY-LAWS	59	52	38	66
ONTARIO GRAND TOTAL ⁸	20,845	20,003	21,200	20,396

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Crime and Traffic Enforcement Statistics, 1978. Data for 1979-81 provided by the Centre's Law Enforcement program. 1981 data are preliminary and subject to revision.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Apprehended Juveniles Charged by Type of Offence, 1978-81

MOST SERIOUS OFFENCE ¹	PERCENTAGE OF APPREHENDED JUVENILES CHARGED ¹⁰			
	1978	1979	1980	1981
Homicide, attempted murder	87.5 ¹¹	100.0 ¹¹	100.0 ¹¹	83.3 ¹¹
Sexual offences	33.7	38.0	44.0	31.8
Assaults (not indecent)	25.9	26.6	24.7	25.7
Robbery	82.8	82.4	82.9	73.6
TOTAL CRIMES OF VIOLENCE	31.0	32.2	31.9	30.1
Break and enter	65.0	62.5	66.4	63.0
Motor vehicle theft	68.1	66.3	67.4	66.5
Theft over \$200	63.8	63.8	62.8	60.3
Shoplifting (under \$200)	20.4	21.3	22.4	22.1
Other theft under \$200	34.3	32.5	34.0	34.2
Have stolen goods	63.6	55.6	55.5	52.0
Frauds	37.2	33.6	34.7	43.1
TOTAL PROPERTY CRIMES	40.9	39.8	41.9	39.2
Offensive weapons	34.4	35.1	34.2	33.1
Arson	13.7	17.9	23.1	16.3
Disturb the peace	4.8	3.3	4.7	3.1
Trespass at night	6.0	7.2	4.1	5.3
Wilful damage (private)	16.7	16.5	19.2	17.8
Wilful damage (public)	26.9	27.3	27.0	24.3
Other Criminal Code	32.0	26.5	26.7	25.1
TOTAL OTHER CRIMES	18.3	17.1	19.7	17.5
TOTAL CRIMINAL CODE	33.9	32.9	35.3	32.8
Cannabis possession	39.9	38.1	43.4	45.6
Cannabis trafficking	83.6	65.9	85.4	78.7
Cannabis - other ³	66.7 ¹¹	75.0 ¹¹	66.7 ¹¹	-
Heroin	-	-	100.0 ¹¹	100.0 ¹¹
Cocaine	100.0 ¹¹	0.0 ¹¹	100.0 ¹¹	100.0 ¹¹
Other NCA drugs ⁴	5.6 ¹¹	64.3 ¹¹	33.3 ¹¹	13.7
Food and Drugs Act ⁵	61.5 ¹¹	76.7 ¹¹	70.7 ¹¹	50.0 ¹¹
TOTAL DRUG STATUTES	42.2	41.0	46.8	46.6
Juvenile Delinquents Act ⁶	47.6	34.7	30.1	30.9
Other federal statutes	14.7	10.2	13.0	19.5
TOTAL FEDERAL STATUTES	36.6	30.1	35.3	36.0
Liquor statutes ⁷	49.6	43.5	42.9	37.9
Other provincial statutes	4.3	5.7	6.0	7.6
TOTAL PROVINCIAL STATUTES	17.9	18.0	18.3	18.3
MUNICIPAL BY-LAWS	7.7	6.9	5.6	8.1
ONTARIO GRAND TOTAL ⁸	31.0	30.1	32.5	30.6

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Crime and Traffic Enforcement Statistics, 1978. Data for 1979-81 provided by the Centre's Law Enforcement program. 1981 data are preliminary and subject to revision.

* Percentage calculated on base figure of less than 50.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLES 1-3

1. The breakdown of offences follows that used in Statistics Canada's annual Crime and Traffic Enforcement Statistics bulletin, although some categories have been combined. When a juvenile is apprehended for more than one offence in connection with a single incident, he is recorded as having been apprehended only once -- for the most serious offence. The most serious offence is the one carrying the maximum penalty allowed by law or, if the penalties are the same, the one considered the most serious by the police or that appears first in the offence classification.
2. A juvenile is counted once each time he is apprehended in connection with a separate illegal incident. This is not an unduplicated count of individuals apprehended during the year.
3. Includes importation and cultivation.
4. For a complete list of drugs covered by the Narcotic Control Act, see Revised Statutes of Canada 1970, Chapter N-1.
5. For a complete list of controlled and restricted drugs covered by the Food and Drugs Act, see Revised Statutes of Canada 1970, Chapter F-27.
6. Includes juveniles apprehended for contributing to juvenile delinquency only.
7. Includes offences under the Liquor Control Act (Revised Statutes of Ontario 1980, Chapter 243) and the Liquor Licence Act (Chapter 244).
8. Excludes all traffic offences.
9. In 1974, Statistics Canada began to collect data on the number of apprehended juveniles who were dealt with informally by the police instead of being formally charged. Beginning in 1978, the category was changed from "juveniles informal" to "juveniles not charged." Although data on juveniles charged and not charged are still collected (and are presented here), since 1979 these data have not been reported. Because of varying police charging practices across the country, the number of juveniles apprehended is now reported in a single category, "juvenile offenders."
10. For the number of juveniles apprehended, see Table 1; for the number of juveniles charged, see Table 2.
11. Percentage calculated on base figure of less than 50.

DISCUSSION

Apprehension

Between 1978 and 1981, police in Ontario had an average of 66,373 encounters a year with suspected juvenile offenders. Some juvenile suspects were apprehended more than once in a year; they were counted each time they were apprehended in a separate illegal incident.

The number of police encounters with juveniles has remained remarkably steady from year to year. The biggest fluctuation was a rise of 2.2% between 1980 and 1981, but there were 740 fewer encounters in 1981 than in 1978.

Table 1 shows the most serious offence* alleged in an average of 1,335 encounters a year. Year-to-year fluctuations ranged from +16.2% to -20.6%, but the 1981 figure of 1,214 was only 13 higher than the 1978 figure.

Violations of provincial liquor statutes were the most serious offences alleged in an average of 3,310 encounters a year. Fluctuations ranged from -5.6% to +2.3%, with 1981's figure down 253 from that of 1978.

Drug-related offences were the most serious offences alleged in 1.8% of all police encounters with juveniles in 1978, 2.1% in 1979, 2.3% in 1980 and 1.8% in 1981. For alcohol-related offences the figures were: 5.2% in 1978, 5.0% in 1979, 4.9% in 1980 and 4.9% in 1981.

* See footnote 1, page 9.

The most common offence for which juveniles were apprehended was shoplifting (under \$200). Shoplifting and other theft under \$200 were the most serious offences recorded in 20,204 police encounters with juveniles in 1978, 30.0% of all encounters. In 1979 the figure was 20,270 (30.6%); 1980, 20,235 (31.0%); and 1981, 22,386 (33.6%).

The second most frequent offence recorded was break and enter. This was the most serious offence alleged in an average of 7,962 police encounters with juveniles a year, representing between 11.4% and 12.8% of all encounters.

Wilful damage to public and private property, usually called vandalism, was the third most frequent offence (except in 1978, when it was fourth). An average of 7,097 encounters a year involved wilful damage as the most serious offence. This represented between 10.4% and 11.0% of all encounters in each year.

Violations of provincial statutes other than liquor statutes and excluding traffic statutes were the fourth most frequent offences (except in 1978, when they were third). Offences in this category include trespassing (Trespass to Property Act), curfew violation (Child Welfare Act), truancy (Education Act), etc. In an average of 6,811 police encounters with juveniles a year, such provincial statute violations were the most serious offences alleged. This was between 8.9% and 12.0% of all encounters in each year.

The next most frequent offence was assault (other than indecent assault, which is considered to be a sexual offence). Assault was the most serious offence recorded in an average of 3,170 encounters a year, or between 4.4% and 5.1% of all police encounters with juveniles in each year.

Of the more than 65,000 police encounters with juveniles each year, the number of repeat encounters with the same individuals is unknown for the province as a whole. The Metropolitan Toronto Police Youth Bureau, however, does provide these data. The Youth Bureau reported that out of 28,740 contacts with juveniles suspected of offences in 1978, 23.96% were repeat contacts with juveniles who had been apprehended on one or more previous occasions during the year. In 1979, 23.45% of 26,476 contacts were repeats; 1980, 26.44% of 24,145; and in 1981, 27.2% of 24,509.

If one-quarter of police contacts were repeat contacts province-wide, it would mean that 66,373 contacts a year (the average number between 1978 and 1981) would involve 49,780 different juveniles. Of course, recidivism rates may vary widely in different parts of the province and a projection based on data from Toronto can provide only a rough estimate of the situation province wide.

Charging

In some parts of the country, the decision about whether to charge a juvenile lies with an authority other than

the police. Where it is a police responsibility, it may fall to a supervisor rather than to the arresting officer. No matter how the decision is made, police encounters with suspected juvenile offenders do not necessarily lead to the laying of charges.

An average of 66,373 yearly encounters with juveniles suspected of offences led to charges being laid in an average of only 20,611 cases. The percentage of police encounters resulting in charges in each year was: 1978, 31.0%; 1979, 30.1%; 1980, 32.5%; 1981, 30.6%.

Table 2 shows the number of juveniles charged and Table 3 the percentage of apprehended juveniles charged in each most serious offence category.

An average of 499 suspected offenders were charged with cannabis possession a year, or 41.8% of the average 1,195 apprehended, while an average 61 of 78 juveniles accused of trafficking in cannabis (78.2%) were charged. Between 41.0% and 46.8% of police encounters with juveniles suspected of drug offences resulted in charges in each year.

Violations of provincial liquor statutes resulted in an average of 1,443 charges out of an average of 3,310 encounters a year. In 1978, 49.6% of juveniles apprehended for alcohol-related offences were charged; this decreased steadily to 37.9% in 1981. Along with an apparent trend to lay charges less often when the most serious offence was alcohol-related,

there may be an opposite, weaker trend to lay charges more frequently in cases of cannabis possession (1978, 39.9% charged; 1979, 38.1%; 1980, 43.4%; 1981, 45.6%).

The percentage of apprehended juveniles charged varied widely according to offence category. So, shoplifting and other theft under \$200 accounted for an average of 31.3% of police encounters and 26.5% of juveniles charged, while break and enter, which accounted for an average of only 12.0% of police encounters, accounted for 24.8% of juveniles charged. Together, these offence categories accounted for more than half of the juveniles charged. Year-to-year fluctuations within each category were small. Between 20.4% and 22.4% of those apprehended for shoplifting (under \$200) were charged; from 32.5% to 34.3% of those apprehended for other theft under \$200 were charged; and 62.5% to 66.4% of those apprehended for break and enter were charged.

The percentage of apprehended juveniles charged was relatively high for other property crimes: motor vehicle theft, from 66.3% to 68.1%; theft over \$200, 60.3% to 63.8%; have stolen goods, 52.0% to 63.6%; frauds, 33.6% to 43.1%. For robbery, classified as a crime of violence, the rate varied between 73.6% and 82.9%, while for assaults the range was 24.7% to 26.6%.

Some offences had very low charging rates. An average of 2,545 juveniles were apprehended for disturbing the peace each year, but only an average of 100 (3.9%) were charged. Similarly, of an average of 6,811 juveniles apprehended for

violating provincial statutes other than liquor statutes and excluding traffic statutes, an average of 392 (5.8%) were charged.

The data suggest that the police are more inclined to charge juveniles engaged in traditionally criminal pursuits, that is, property crimes for profit, than those engaged in shoplifting, rowdy behavior, fighting, truancy, curfew-breaking, etc. An interesting exception to this pattern is the relatively high charging rate for cannabis possession and alcohol-related offences.

Detention

No province-wide data are available on the proportion of juveniles charged with offences who are detained prior to appearing in court. The Metropolitan Toronto Police Youth Bureau provides this information for Toronto.

The Toronto police charge a smaller percentage of juveniles than are charged in the province as a whole. In 1978, the Youth Bureau charged 5,365 juveniles (including repeaters), 18.7% of the 28,740 apprehended for offences; in 1979, 5,335 or 20.2% of the 26,476 juveniles apprehended were charged; in 1980, 5,864 or 24.3% of 24,145 were charged; and in 1981, the figure was 5,505 or 22.5% of 24,509. Of the juveniles charged, the percentage detained prior to court appearance was 12.0% (643) in 1978; 12.1% (645) in 1979; 15.2% (891) in 1980; and 16.2% (892) in 1981.

Juveniles detained prior to appearing in court or pending trial are held in observation and detention homes operated by the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Implications

An average of 66,373 juveniles a year were apprehended by the police between 1978 and 1981. An unknown number of individuals were included in this count more than once -- in Toronto about one-quarter of police encounters with juveniles suspected of offences involved individuals previously apprehended during the year.

Of the juveniles apprehended, an average of 31.1% were charged. Records of the other 68.9% exist only in highly confidential police files. So, more than two-thirds of juveniles suspected of offences (including repeaters) would not be susceptible to an educational intervention unless they were referred to a program on a voluntary basis by the police.

CHAPTER 2:

COURT STATISTICS

TABLE 4

Number and Percentage of Charges Disposed in
Juvenile Court by Adjudication, 1980-81, 1981-82

COURT ADJUDICATION		DISPOSED CHARGES	
		1980-81	1981-82
Not found delinquent ¹	N %	8,580 25.5	8,432 25.9
Found delinquent	N %	25,087 74.5	24,182 74.1
TOTAL	N	33,667	32,614

Source: Data provided by Information and Computer Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General.

TABLE 5

Number and Percentage of Charges Resulting in a
Finding of Delinquency by Disposition, 1980-81, 1981-82

COURT DISPOSITION		CHARGES RESULTING IN A FINDING OF DELINQUENCY ⁴	
		1980-81	1981-82
Training school	N %	1,737 6.9	1,486 6.1
CAS ²	N %	651 2.6	584 2.4
Probation	N %	9,086 36.2	8,692 35.9
Other ³	N %	13,613 54.3	13,420 55.5
TOTAL	N	25,087	24,182

Source: Data provided by Information and Computer Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General.

TABLE 6

Number and Percentage of Completed Juvenile Court
Cases by Adjudication, 1980-81, 1981-82

COURT ADJUDICATION		COMPLETED CASES ⁵	
		1980-81	1981-82
Not found delinquent ⁶	N %	3,528 17.5	3,778 18.7
Found delinquent ⁷	N %	16,582 82.5	16,427 81.3
TOTAL	N	20,110	20,205

Source: Data provided by Information and Computer Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General.

TABLE 7

Number and Percentage of Completed Juvenile Court
Cases Resulting in a Finding of Delinquency by Disposition, 1980-81, 1981-82

COURT DISPOSITION		CASES RESULTING IN A FINDING OF DELINQUENCY ⁴	
		1980-81	1981-82
Training school	N %	843 5.1	763 4.6
CAS ²	N %	440 2.7	390 2.4
Probation	N %	5,792 34.9	5,495 33.5
Other ³	N %	9,507 57.3	9,779 59.5
TOTAL	N	16,582	16,427

Source: Data provided by Information and Computer Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLES 4-7

1. Includes dismissed, withdrawn, transferred to another court and warrant issued for non-appearance. Hearings on an unknown number of charges were adjourned without a finding of delinquency (Juvenile Delinquents Act, Section 16). Charges disposed in this manner are included in the "found delinquent" category because they cannot be separated out from similar dispositions that occur after findings of delinquency. This means that the number of charges not resulting in a finding of delinquency is underestimated and, correspondingly, that the number of charges resulting in a finding of delinquency is overestimated.
2. Placed in the care of the Children's Aid Society.
3. Includes fine, restitution, suspended disposition, adjournment, reprimand, etc.
4. Includes, in the category "other," disposition by adjournment without a finding of delinquency.
5. A case includes all charges heard together. A juvenile involved in more than one completed case during the year specified will be counted once for each case.
6. Not found delinquent on any charge in the case. Cases resulting in adjournment without a finding of delinquency are included in the "found delinquent" category (see footnote 1).
7. Found delinquent on at least one charge in the case. Includes adjournment without a finding of delinquency (see footnote 1).

TABLE 8

Number and Percentage of Juveniles with Charges Disposed by Adjudication, 1978-81

COURT ADJUDICATION		JUVENILES ¹ WITH CHARGES DISPOSED ²			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
Not found delinquent ³	N %	2,864 21.8	2,685 20.2	3,415 25.5	3,731 27.2
Found delinquent ⁴	N %	10,272 78.2	10,578 79.8	9,974 74.5	9,973 72.8
ONTARIO TOTAL	N	13,136	13,263	13,389	13,704

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Juvenile Delinquents, 1978-81.

TABLE 9

Number and Percentage of Juveniles Found Delinquent by Disposition, 1978-81

COURT DISPOSITION ⁵		JUVENILES ¹ FOUND DELINQUENT ⁴			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
Training school	N %	696 6.8	723 6.8	712 7.1	563 5.6
CAS	N %	508 4.9	518 4.9	441 4.4	391 3.9
Probation	N %	4,565 44.4	4,554 43.1	4,667 46.8	4,772 47.8
Other	N %	4,503 43.8	4,783 45.2	4,154 41.6	4,247 42.6
ONTARIO TOTAL	N	10,272	10,578	9,974	9,973

Source: Data provided by Juvenile Services, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 10

Number of Juveniles Found Delinquent by Age and Sex, 1978-81

AGE ⁶		JUVENILES ¹ FOUND DELINQUENT ⁴			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
7 to 11	Male	488	510	421	443
	Female	63	66	60	65
12, 13	Male	1,805	1,760	1,654	1,732
	Female	343	340	318	378
14, 15	Male	6,003	6,289	6,104	5,999
	Female	1,243	1,287	1,203	1,212
Other ⁷	Male	291	261	173	119
	Female	36	65	41	25
ONTARIO TOTAL	Male	8,587	8,820	8,352	8,293
	Female	1,685	1,758	1,622	1,680

Source: Data provided by Juvenile Services, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 11

Number of Juveniles with Charges Disposed and Percentage of Juveniles Found Delinquent by Most Serious Charge, 1978-81

MOST SERIOUS CHARGE ⁸		JUVENILES WITH CHARGES DISPOSED ²			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
Crimes of violence ⁹	Number disposed % delinquent	672 70.2	733 73.5	773 69.3	800 70.4
Break and enter	Number disposed % delinquent	2,989 84.6	2,774 87.4	2,870 84.4	2,803 81.4
Take car without consent ¹⁰	Number disposed % delinquent	283 84.1	314 86.9	276 81.9	244 84.0
Theft	Number disposed % delinquent	3,445 77.6	3,672 79.8	3,638 73.5	4,139 72.0
Have stolen goods	Number disposed % delinquent	932 70.2	887 69.9	887 67.8	975 66.6
Frauds	Number disposed % delinquent	141 78.7	148 81.1	166 72.9	198 75.3
Willful damage	Number disposed % delinquent	892 76.9	913 75.8	1,030 72.4	1,022 65.4
Traffic offences ¹¹	Number disposed % delinquent	687 79.5	638 81.0	597 74.7	521 77.2
NCA offences ¹²	Number disposed % delinquent	348 77.6	432 77.3	505 75.4	388 72.9
Liquor offences ¹³	Number disposed % delinquent	763 82.2	844 82.8	763 76.4	723 76.2
School offences ¹⁴	Number disposed % delinquent	371 67.7	407 65.4	463 49.9	354 51.7
Municipal by-laws	Number disposed % delinquent	45 80.0	33 63.6	41 53.7	32 62.5
Other	Number disposed % delinquent	1,568 75.1	1,468 77.7	1,380 71.4	1,505 68.8
ONTARIO TOTAL	Number disposed % delinquent	13,136 78.2	13,263 79.8	13,389 74.5	13,704 72.8

Source: Data provided by Juvenile Services, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 12

Percentage of Juveniles Found Delinquent by Most Serious Charge, 1978-81

MOST SERIOUS CHARGE ⁸	PERCENTAGE OF JUVENILES ¹ FOUND DELINQUENT ⁴			
	1978	1979	1980	1981
Crimes of violence ⁹	4.6	5.1	5.4	5.6
Break and enter	24.6	22.9	24.3	22.9
Take car without consent ¹⁰	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.1
Theft	26.0	27.7	26.8	29.9
Have stolen goods	6.4	5.9	6.0	6.5
Frauds	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.5
Wilful damage	6.7	6.5	7.5	6.7
Traffic offences ¹¹	5.3	4.9	4.5	4.0
NCA offences ¹²	2.6	3.2	3.8	2.8
Liquor offences ¹³	6.1	6.6	5.8	5.5
School offences ¹⁴	2.4	2.5	2.3	1.8
Municipal by-laws	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2
Other	11.5	10.8	9.9	10.4
ONTARIO TOTAL	100	100	100	100

Source: Data provided by Juvenile Services, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 13

Number and Percentage of Juveniles Found Delinquent Committed
to Training School by Most Serious Charge, 1978-81

MOST SERIOUS CHARGE ⁸		JUVENILES ¹ COMMITTED TO TRAINING SCHOOL			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
Crimes of violence ⁹	N	40	69	54	42
	%	5.7	9.5	7.6	7.5
Break and enter	N	303	243	279	223
	%	43.5	33.6	39.2	39.6
Take car without consent ¹⁰	N	17	11	11	10
	%	2.4	1.5	1.5	1.8
Theft	N	133	162	150	133
	%	19.1	22.4	21.1	23.6
Have stolen goods	N	54	47	39	41
	%	7.8	6.5	5.5	7.3
Frauds	N	9	8	9	9
	%	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.6
Wilful damage	N	22	22	27	20
	%	3.2	3.0	3.8	3.6
Traffic offences ¹¹	N	4	9	8	3
	%	0.6	1.2	1.1	0.5
NCA offences ¹²	N	6	12	17	8
	%	0.9	1.7	2.4	1.4
Liquor offences ¹³	N	15	15	19	5
	%	2.2	2.1	2.7	0.9
School offences ¹⁴	N	11	10	4	5
	%	1.6	1.4	0.6	0.9
Municipal by-laws	N	0	0	0	0
	%	-	-	-	-
Other	N	82	115	95	64
	%	11.8	15.9	13.3	11.4
ONTARIO TOTAL	N	696	723	712	563
	%	100	100	100	100

Source: Data provided by Juvenile Services, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 14

Number and Percentage of Juveniles Found Delinquent Placed in
the Care of the Children's Aid Society by Most Serious Charge,
1978-81

MOST SERIOUS CHARGE ⁸		JUVENILES PLACED IN THE CARE OF CAS			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
Crimes of violence ⁹	N %	24 4.7	26 5.0	17 3.9	14 3.6
Break and enter	N %	118 23.2	127 24.5	124 28.1	94 24.0
Take car without consent ¹⁰	N %	13 2.6	10 1.9	8 1.8	9 2.3
Theft	N %	127 25.0	146 28.2	112 25.4	123 31.5
Have stolen goods	N %	41 8.1	27 5.2	21 4.8	25 6.4
Frauds	N %	5 1.0	7 1.4	5 1.1	3 0.8
Wilful damage	N %	29 5.7	32 6.2	19 4.3	19 4.9
Traffic offences ¹¹	N %	9 1.8	8 1.5	6 1.4	2 0.5
NCA offences ¹²	N %	5 1.0	10 1.9	4 0.9	5 1.3
Liquor offences ¹³	N %	28 5.5	19 3.7	28 6.3	8 2.0
School offences ¹⁴	N %	33 6.5	34 6.6	36 8.2	30 7.7
Municipal by-laws	N %	2 0.4	0 -	0 -	0 -
Other	N %	74 14.6	72 13.9	61 13.8	59 15.1
ONTARIO TOTAL	N %	508 100	518 100	441 100	391 100

Source: Data provided by Juvenile Services, Canadian Centre for Justice
Statistics, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 15

Number and Percentage of Juveniles Found Delinquent
Placed on Probation by Most Serious Charge, 1978-81

MOST SERIOUS CHARGE ⁸		JUVENILES ¹ PLACED ON PROBATION			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
Crimes of violence ⁹	N	240	231	273	303
	%	5.3	5.1	5.8	6.3
Break and enter	N	1,356	1,324	1,321	1,358
	%	29.7	29.1	28.3	28.5
Take car without consent ¹⁰	N	99	119	113	104
	%	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.2
Theft	N	1,210	1,225	1,256	1,327
	%	26.5	26.9	26.9	27.8
Have stolen goods	N	270	279	278	311
	%	5.9	6.1	6.0	6.5
Frauds	N	55	57	63	81
	%	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.7
Wilful damage	N	305	312	356	336
	%	6.7	6.9	7.6	7.0
Traffic offences ¹¹	N	145	134	106	125
	%	3.2	2.9	2.3	2.6
NCA offences ¹²	N	129	152	178	145
	%	2.8	3.3	3.8	3.0
Liquor offences ¹³	N	216	244	203	165
	%	4.7	5.4	4.3	3.5
School offences ¹⁴	N	88	94	121	81
	%	1.9	2.1	2.6	1.7
Municipal by-laws	N	8	3	3	4
	%	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Other	N	444	380	396	432
	%	9.7	8.3	8.5	9.1
ONTARIO TOTAL	N	4,565	4,554	4,667	4,772
	%	100	100	100	100

Source: Data provided by Juvenile Services, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 16

Number and Percentage of Juveniles Found Delinquent Disposed
in Other Ways by Most Serious Charge, 1978-81

MOST SERIOUS CHARGE ⁸		JUVENILES ¹ DISPOSED IN OTHER WAYS			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
Crimes of violence ⁹	N	168	213	192	204
	%	3.7	4.5	4.6	4.8
Break and enter	N	752	731	697	608
	%	16.7	15.3	16.8	14.3
Take car without consent ¹⁰	N	109	133	94	82
	%	2.4	2.8	2.3	1.9
Theft	N	1,205	1,399	1,157	1,398
	%	26.8	29.2	27.9	32.9
Have stolen goods	N	289	267	263	272
	%	6.4	5.6	6.3	6.4
Frauds	N	42	48	44	56
	%	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.3
Wilful damage	N	330	326	344	293
	%	7.3	6.8	8.3	6.9
Traffic offences ¹¹	N	388	366	326	272
	%	8.6	7.7	7.8	6.4
NCA offences ¹²	N	130	160	182	125
	%	2.9	3.3	4.4	2.9
Liquor offences ¹³	N	368	421	333	373
	%	8.2	8.8	8.0	8.8
School offences ¹⁴	N	119	128	70	67
	%	2.6	2.7	1.7	1.6
Municipal by-laws	N	26	18	19	16
	%	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4
Other	N	577	573	433	481
	%	12.8	12.0	10.4	11.3
ONTARIO TOTAL	N	4,503	4,783	4,154	4,247
	%	100	100	100	100

Source: Data provided by Juvenile Services, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada.

TABLE 17

Number and Percentage of Juveniles with Charges Disposed in Metropolitan Toronto and Ontario Courts by Most Serious Charge, 1980

MOST SERIOUS CHARGE ⁸	JUVENILES ¹ WITH CHARGES DISPOSED ²						
	1980						
	TORONTO	ETOBICOKE	SCARBOROUGH	NORTH YORK	METRO TORONTO TOTAL	ONTARIO TOTAL	
Crimes of violence ⁹	N 156 9.6	39 6.5	17 7.0	58 7.3	270 8.3	773 5.8	
Break and enter	N 234 14.4	73 12.2	25 10.2	125 15.8	457 14.0	2,870 21.4	
Take car without consent ¹⁰	N 26 1.6	20 3.4	7 2.9	18 2.3	71 2.2	276 2.1	
Theft	N 481 29.7	185 31.0	90 36.9	220 27.8	976 30.0	3,638 27.2	
Have stolen goods	N 148 9.1	46 7.7	29 11.9	78 9.8	301 9.3	887 6.7	
Frauds	N 20 1.2	7 1.2	4 1.6	10 1.3	41 1.3	166 1.2	
Willful damage	N 81 5.0	30 5.0	21 8.6	65 8.2	197 6.1	1,030 7.7	
Traffic offences ¹¹	N 22 1.4	21 3.5	11 4.5	23 2.9	77 2.4	597 4.5	
NCA offences ¹²	N 78 4.8	20 3.4	1 0.4	41 5.2	140 4.3	505 3.8	
Liquor offences ¹³	N 66 4.1	32 5.4	23 9.4	20 2.5	141 4.3	763 5.7	
School offences ¹⁴	N 100 6.2	45 7.5	4 1.6	0	149 4.6	463 3.5	
Municipal by-laws	N 0	2 0.3	0	1 0.1	3 0.1	41 0.3	
Other	N 208 12.8	77 12.9	12 4.9	133 16.7	430 13.2	1,380 10.3	
TOTAL	N 1,620 100	597 100	244 100	792 100	3,253 100	13,389 100	

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Ontario Juvenile Delinquents, 1980.

TABLE 16

Number and Percentage of Juveniles with Charges Disposed in Metropolitan Toronto and Ontario Courts by Most Serious Charge, 1981

MOST SERIOUS CHARGE ⁸	JUVENILES ¹ WITH CHARGES DISPOSED ²						
	1981						
	TORONTO	ETOBICOKE	SCARBOROUGH	NORTH YORK	METRO TORONTO TOTAL	ONTARIO TOTAL	
Crimes of violence ⁹	N 150 8.7	28 7.0	51 5.8	45 6.3	274 7.4	800 5.8	
Break and enter	N 214 12.4	47 11.8	108 12.4	98 13.8	467 12.6	2,803 20.5	
Take car without consent ¹⁰	N 22 1.3	18 4.5	10 1.1	15 2.1	65 1.8	244 1.8	
Theft	N 537 31.2	128 32.0	372 42.7	251 35.3	1,288 34.7	4,139 30.2	
Have stolen goods	N 193 11.2	38 9.5	72 8.3	78 11.0	381 10.3	975 7.1	
Frauds	N 27 1.6	13 3.3	9 1.0	11 1.5	60 1.6	198 1.4	
Willful damage	N 113 6.6	19 4.8	91 10.4	64 9.0	287 7.7	1,022 7.5	
Traffic offences ¹¹	N 29 1.7	10 2.5	9 1.0	9 1.3	57 1.5	521 3.8	
NCA offences ¹²	N 55 3.2	11 2.8	27 3.1	19 2.7	112 3.0	388 2.8	
Liquor offences ¹³	N 71 4.1	21 5.3	36 4.1	24 3.4	152 4.1	723 5.3	
School offences ¹⁴	N 87 5.0	11 2.8	11 1.3	0 -	109 2.9	354 2.6	
Municipal by-laws	N 2 0.1	0 -	1 0.1	0 -	3 0.1	32 0.2	
Other	N 223 12.9	56 14.0	75 8.6	98 13.8	452 12.2	1,505 11.0	
TOTAL	N 1,723 100	400 100	872 100	712 100	3,707 100	13,704 100	

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Ontario Juvenile Delinquents, 1981.

TABLE 19

Number and Percentage of Juveniles with Charges Disposed in Metropolitan
Toronto Courts and in Ontario by Adjudication, 1980, 1981

COURT ADJUDICATION		JUVENILES ¹ WITH CHARGES DISPOSED ²					
		1980					
		TORONTO	ETOBICOKE	SCARBOROUGH	NORTH YORK	METRO TORONTO TOTAL	ONTARIO TOTAL
Not found delinquent ³	N %	746 46.0	79 13.2	33 13.5	130 16.4	988 30.4	3,415 25.5
Found delinquent ⁴	N %	874 54.0	518 86.8	211 86.5	662 83.6	2,265 69.6	9,974 74.5
TOTAL	N	1,620	597	244	792	3,253	13,389
		1981					
Not found delinquent	N %	837 48.6	38 9.5	204 23.4	132 18.5	1,211 32.7	3,731 27.2
Found delinquent	N %	886 51.4	362 90.5	668 76.6	580 81.5	2,496 67.3	9,973 72.8
TOTAL	N	1,723	400	872	712	3,707	13,704

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics,
Ontario Juvenile Delinquents, 1980, 1981.

TABLE 20

Number and Percentage of Juveniles Found Delinquent in Metropolitan Toronto
Courts and in Ontario by Disposition, 1980, 1981

COURT DISPOSITION ⁵		JUVENILES ¹ FOUND DELINQUENT ⁴						
		1980						
		TORONTO	ETOBICOKE	SCARBOROUGH	NORTH YORK	METRO TORONTO TOTAL	ONTARIO TOTAL	
Training school	N %	76 8.7	9 1.7	1 0.5	19 2.9	105 4.6	712 7.1	
CAS	N %	24 2.7	19 3.7	0 -	18 2.7	61 2.7	441 4.4	
Probation	N %	419 47.9	167 32.2	36 17.1	106 16.0	728 32.1	4,667 46.8	
Other	N %	355 40.6	323 62.4	174 82.5	519 78.4	1,371 60.5	4,154 41.6	
TOTAL	N	874	518	211	662	2,265	9,974	
		1981						
		N %						
Training school	N %	30 3.4	4 1.1	6 0.9	12 2.1	52 2.1	563 5.6	
CAS	N %	31 3.5	13 3.6	7 1.0	1 0.2	52 2.1	391 3.9	
Probation	N %	357 40.3	133 36.7	134 20.1	127 21.9	751 30.1	4,772 47.8	
Other	N %	468 52.8	212 58.6	521 78.0	440 75.9	1,641 65.7	4,247 42.6	
TOTAL	N	886	362	668	580	2,496	9,973	

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics,
Ontario Juvenile Delinquents, 1980, 1981.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLES 8-20

1. Includes a very small number of adults charged under the the Juvenile Delinquents Act.
2. Each individual who appears in juvenile court and has at least one charge disposed in the year specified is counted once. The number reported has been shown by Statistics Canada analysis to be overestimated by about 3%. This is attributed to error inherent in the process of linking all of an individual's charges for a year.
3. Not found delinquent on any charge during the year specified.
4. Found delinquent on at least one charge during the year specified.
5. Only the most serious disposition for each juvenile found delinquent is included in this table. Dispositions, from most to least serious are: committed to training school; placed in the care of the Children's Aid Society; placed on probation; and disposed in other ways including fine, restitution, suspended disposition, adjournment, reprimand, etc.
6. Age when the offence was committed.
7. Includes adults charged under the Juvenile Delinquents Act and persons whose age is not known.
8. The charge that carried the most serious disposition.
9. Includes homicide, attempted murder, sexual offences, assaults and robbery.
10. In Tables 1, 2 and 3 this charge is included under motor vehicle theft.
11. Includes charges under the Criminal Code and provincial statutes. These offences are omitted from Tables 1, 2 and 3.
12. Includes charges under the Narcotic Control Act only. Charges under the Food and Drugs Act are included in the category "other."
13. Includes charges under provincial statutes only (see footnote 7, page 9).
14. Includes charges under the Education Act (Revised Statutes of Ontario 1980, Chapter 129).

DISCUSSION

Evaluation of the data

This chapter deals with data from two sources: the Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General, and the Juvenile Services program of Statistics Canada's Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

The Ontario Attorney General administers the Provincial Courts (Family Division), which hear the cases of juveniles accused of offences. These courts file daily reports on their operations to the Attorney General.

An exact correspondence between the number of juveniles (including repeaters) charged with offences by the police and the number of cases disposed in juvenile court cannot be expected for three reasons: all cases are not disposed in the year the charges are laid; Statistics Canada police data do not include the cases of juveniles charged only with traffic offences; and all juveniles charged with offences do not necessarily appear in juvenile court. Also, the Ontario Attorney General reports juvenile court data for its fiscal years, while Statistics Canada uses calendar years.

Considering these factors, the correspondence between police data on juveniles charged and Attorney General data on cases disposed is remarkably close. In 1980, the police reported 21,200 juveniles charged in Ontario, while in fiscal 1980-81 the

Attorney General reported 20,110 juvenile cases disposed. In 1981, the police reported 20,396 juveniles charged and in fiscal 1981-82 the Attorney General reported 20,205 cases disposed. Figures for cases disposed in the calendar years 1980 and 1981, made available by the Attorney General's Information and Computer Systems Branch on request, were 20,082 in 1980 and 20,283 in 1981.

The Juvenile Services program of the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (Statistics Canada) provides detailed information about juveniles with charges disposed and about charges against juveniles. The data on juveniles are not comparable to data on juveniles charged by the police or to Attorney General data on cases disposed because Statistics Canada figures do not include repeaters, that is, each juvenile is counted only once in a year. Data from Statistics Canada and the Ontario Attorney General on the number of charges disposed should be roughly comparable. This is far from being the case.

Juvenile courts send information directly to Statistics Canada. There seems to be considerable variation in the completeness of the data provided by Ontario courts. In 1980, Statistics Canada reported 25,478 charges disposed compared to 33,667 reported by the Attorney General for 1980-81; in 1981, Statistics Canada reported 26,992 compared to 32,614 reported by the Attorney General for 1981-82. (Attorney General

figures for calendar 1980 and 1981 were 33,540 for 1980 and 33,546 for 1981.)

Because Statistics Canada does not provide a figure comparable to the Attorney General's figure for cases, it was not possible to know whether under-reporting from Ontario courts affected whole cases or only charges. On request, Statistics Canada was able to do a count for 1981 similar to the Attorney General's case count. The figures showed that Statistics Canada had received reports on 19.7% fewer cases than the Attorney General.

Under-reporting varied from district to district. Cochrane North, in the northeastern part of the province, reported 185 juvenile cases to the Attorney General in calendar 1981 but only 3 to Statistics Canada. Essex, in the southwest, reported 442 cases to the Attorney General and 241 (45.5% fewer) to Statistics Canada. The four Metropolitan Toronto courts -- Toronto, Scarborough, Etobicoke and North York -- reported 6,172 cases to the Attorney General but only 4,403 (28.7% fewer) to Statistics Canada. Also, in 6 of 51 districts, more cases were reported to Statistics Canada than to the Attorney General. Of these, 5 involved small discrepancies of between 6 and 23 cases and one (Algoma, in the northeast) a discrepancy of 49 cases.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the above discussion:

- There is no reason to believe that data on juvenile charges and cases disposed supplied by the Ontario Attorney General are incomplete.
- Some Ontario courts are not supplying complete data on disposed juvenile court cases to Statistics Canada. In 1981, about one-fifth of such cases and about the same fraction of disposed charges were not reported to Statistics Canada. This means the information on juveniles with charges disposed (excluding repeaters) contained in this chapter (Tables 8-20) is based on incomplete data.

It is not clear whether or to what extent missing data has biased the information reported here. There is no reason to believe that courts tend to under-report some types of cases more than others. If this does occur, there is no reason to believe it occurs consistently in different courts. Still, it is possible that some types of cases are consistently under-reported, perhaps for reasons associated with the reporting process itself, and this may have introduced unknown biases into the data presented in this chapter.

Adjudication, disposition

A juvenile charged with an offence is not judged guilty or not guilty of that offence but is either adjudged

delinquent or the charge is disposed without a finding of delinquency. (In some cases the juvenile may be transferred to adult court for trial.)

If a juvenile is adjudged delinquent, several dispositions or combinations of dispositions are possible. The judge can suspend final disposition or adjourn the case for a definite or indefinite period, impose a fine, place the juvenile on probation, impose any other conditions he deems advisable or commit the juvenile to the care of the Children's Aid Society or to training school.

Tables 4 and 5 show the court findings on all charges disposed in Ontario juvenile courts in the fiscal years 1980-81 and 1981-82 and Tables 6 and 7 show the findings for all completed cases. (A case can involve a single charge or two or more charges heard together.) The figures in these tables were provided by the Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General and are believed to be complete.

In each year, about three-quarters of the disposed charges resulted in adjudications of delinquency and more than four-fifths of the completed cases resulted in a finding of delinquency on at least one charge. These figures include an unknown number of charges and cases disposed by adjournment without a finding of delinquency (see footnotes 1 and 7,

page 20).^{*} Data presented later suggest that whether cases are adjourned without or after a finding of delinquency may depend on the preference of the judge hearing the case (see pages 42-44).

In terms of numbers, more than 20,000 cases were completed in each year of which about 16,500 resulted in findings of delinquency. (Some juveniles had more than one case completed in the course of a year.)

Of the cases resulting in findings of delinquency, about one-third led to placement on probation and about 5% to committal to training school. The remainder, about three-fifths of the cases, led to dispositions that would not entail involvement with the juvenile correctional services system. These include placement in the care of the Children's Aid Society and

^{*} According to Statistics Canada figures, adjournment without a finding of delinquency accounted for 2,945 (11.6%) of the 25,478 charges reported in 1980 and 3,373 (12.5%) of the 26,992 in 1981. Adjournment without a finding of delinquency was the most serious disposition for 1,739 (13.0%) of the 13,389 juveniles (excluding repeaters) with charges disposed in 1980 and 1,969 (14.4%) of the 13,704 in 1981. If 12% of the disposed charges reported to the Attorney General resulted in adjournment without a finding of delinquency, this would mean about 4,000 charges a year classified in the "found delinquent" category did not actually result in findings of delinquency. Shifting these charges to the "not found delinquent" category would change the fraction of charges resulting in a finding of delinquency from about three-quarters to about five-eighths. Similarly, although Statistics Canada figures for juveniles with charges disposed do not include repeaters and are therefore not comparable to Attorney General case figures which include repeaters, if about 13.5% of cases reported to the Attorney General resulted in adjournment without a finding of delinquency, roughly 2,750 cases a year classified "found delinquent," did not result in such a finding. Shifting these cases to the "not found delinquent" category would change the percentage found delinquent from about 82% to about 68%.

the dispositions grouped in the category "other" -- fine, restitution, suspended disposition, adjournment, reprimand, etc.

In number terms, of the approximately 16,500 juveniles (including repeaters) adjudged delinquent, about 5,700 were placed on probation and about 800 were committed to training school while about 10,000 received dispositions that would not bring them into contact with the juvenile corrections system.

The rest of the data presented in this chapter was collected by Statistics Canada and is based on incomplete reports. It is not known in what ways the findings may have been influenced by selective under-reporting. Juveniles were counted only once in a year and totals include a small number of adults charged under the Juvenile Delinquents Act.

Table 8 shows that a smaller percentage of juveniles who had charges disposed in 1980 and 1981 were adjudged delinquent on at least one charge than in the previous years. The figures were: 1978, 78.2%; 1979, 79.8%; 1980, 74.5%; 1981, 72.8%. Data on disposition (Table 9) show no clear trends.

Table 10 shows the age and sex of juveniles who were found delinquent. Older juveniles and boys were more frequent than younger juveniles and girls. No trends over time could be discerned.

Looking at the most serious charges* against juveniles (Table 11) and the percentage of juveniles found delinquent that

* See footnote 8, page 33,

falls into each offence category (Table 12), the dominant impression is of year-to-year consistency. Although the percentage of juveniles charged who were found delinquent varied by offence, the nature of the charge did not influence judicial behavior nearly to the extent it influenced police charging practices.

Theft accounted for the highest percentage of juveniles found delinquent -- between 26.0% and 29.9% in each year. Break and enter was second, accounting for 22.9% to 24.6%, and all other offences were far behind. Alcohol-related offences accounted for 5.5% to 6.6% of juveniles found delinquent and offences under the Narcotic Control Act for 2.6% to 3.8%.

Looking at disposition by charge for juveniles found delinquent (Tables 13 to 16), year-to-year consistency is again notable. Of juveniles committed to training schools, the highest percentage (33.6% to 43.5%) were found delinquent on break and enter charges. The second most frequent category was theft (19.1% to 23.6%). Alcohol-related offences accounted for 0.9% to 2.7% of juveniles committed to training schools and Narcotic Control Act offences for 0.9% to 2.4%.

Among probationers, also, break and enter was the most frequent offence and theft was second, although the difference between the percentages in the two categories was smaller (break and enter, 28.3% to 29.7%; theft, 26.5% to 27.8%). Of juveniles placed in the care of the Children's Aid Society,

25.0% to 31.5% were found delinquent on theft charges and 23.2% to 28.1% on break and enter charges, and of juveniles disposed in other ways (fine, adjournment, etc.), between 26.8% and 32.9% were found delinquent for theft and 14.3% to 16.8% for break and enter.

Alcohol-related offences accounted for 3.5% to 5.4% of probationers, 2.0% to 6.3% of juveniles placed in the care of the Children's Aid Society, and 8.0% to 8.8% of juveniles disposed in other ways. For Narcotic Control Act offences, the percentages were: probationers, 2.8% to 3.8%; Children's Aid Society, 0.9% to 1.9%; other, 2.9% to 4.4%.

Metropolitan Toronto

One of the problems with province-wide statistics is that marked regional differences may cancel each other out, producing averages that are typical of nowhere. Unfortunately, when looking at regional differences, so many factors may be varying at the same time -- actual delinquency patterns, police practices, court behavior, demographic and sociological variables -- it is impossible to untangle them.

An examination of the statistics from the four Metropolitan Toronto courts proved interesting. The court in which a juvenile's case is heard is chosen on the basis of where the alleged offence is committed. So, at least to some extent, the four courts hear cases of juveniles from all over the city. Also, the police force is the same throughout the

Metropolitan Toronto area -- the Metropolitan Toronto Police Youth Bureau.

Tables 17 and 18 show that, as far as the charges against them are concerned, the differences between juveniles with charges disposed in the four Metropolitan Toronto courts and in the province as a whole are minor, although break and enter seems to be less prevalent in Toronto. Court findings, on the other hand, showed considerable differences. (It should be kept in mind that there seemed to be a high rate of under-reporting from Toronto courts to Statistics Canada and this could influence the results.)

There was a relatively small difference between Metropolitan Toronto courts and the province as a whole in the percentage of juveniles with charges disposed who were found delinquent on at least one charge, with a smaller percentage found delinquent in the Toronto area (Table 19). But the figure for the four Toronto courts together masked the fact that in Etobicoke, Scarborough and North York, the percentage found delinquent was higher than in the whole province, while in Toronto it was considerably lower.

Under the Juvenile Delinquents Act, a judge can adjourn a case without a finding of delinquency (JDA, Section 16) or after a finding of delinquency (JDA, Section 20 (1) b). In 1980, the percentage of juveniles with charges disposed whose cases were adjourned without a finding of delinquency in the four Toronto area courts were: Etobicoke, 3.7%; Scarborough, 7.8%;

North York, 9.0%; Toronto, 35.8%. In 1981, the figures were: Etobicoke, 2.5%; Scarborough, 12.2%; North York, 12.6%; Toronto, 34.4%. Looking at the percentage of juveniles with charges disposed whose cases were adjourned after a finding of delinquency, the figures for 1980 were: Etobicoke, 28.0%; Scarborough, 46.7%; North York, 8.2%; Toronto, 8.6%. Figures for 1981 were: Etobicoke, 24.3%; Scarborough, 35.4%; North York, 11.1%; Toronto, 10.9%. In North York, where adjournment either before or after a finding of delinquency was not a common disposition, the court suspended disposition after a finding of delinquency (JDA, Section 20 (1) a) for 30.4% of juveniles with charges disposed in 1980 and 33.0% in 1981.

The most likely explanation for these differences between courts would seem to be judges' preferences.

Table 20 compares the dispositions of juveniles found delinquent in the four Metropolitan Toronto courts and the province as a whole. (Suspended disposition and adjournment after a finding of delinquency are included in the category "other.") The Toronto court differed less from province-wide figures than did the other three. But a greater proportion of juveniles who appeared before the Toronto court does not appear in the table because a much higher percentage was not found delinquent.

Implications

More than 20,000 juvenile court cases were completed in Ontario in each of the last two years and about 16,500 of these cases resulted in findings of delinquency.* Of the approximately 16,500 juveniles (including repeaters) found delinquent, about 10,000 received dispositions that would not bring them into contact with the juvenile correctional services system, that is, dispositions other than probation or committal to a training school. This means there are roughly 6,500 juveniles a year (including repeaters) -- 5,700 probationers and 800 training school wards -- who could be reached by preventive drug/alcohol education programs run through the juvenile corrections system.

If such programs were designed for juveniles in trouble with the law, they could also be made available to some of the roughly 10,000 juveniles now receiving dispositions that do not bring them into the correctional system. Under both the Juvenile Delinquents Act and the Young Offenders Act, which is to replace it, judges could refer juveniles to drug/alcohol education programs under provisions which give them the authority to impose conditions deemed "advisable" or "reasonable" on the release of young persons found delinquent or guilty of offences.

* Included in the approximately 16,500 cases resulting in findings of delinquency are cases disposed by adjournment without finding of delinquency (see footnotes 1 and 7, page 20).

These programs, possibly run by or in conjunction with the Probation and Aftercare offices of the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, could also take referrals from other agencies that deal with such juveniles.

CHAPTER 3:

DRUG AND ALCOHOL-RELATED CHARGES

TABLE 21

Number of Drug and Alcohol-Related Charges Disposed and Number
and Percentage Resulting in a Finding of Delinquency by Type of Charge, 1978-81

DRUG AND ALCOHOL-RELATED CHARGES		DISPOSED CHARGES			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
NCA, possession	Total disposed Number delinquent % delinquent	421 301 71.5	494 359 72.7	636 442 69.5	536 362 67.5
NCA, other	Total disposed Number delinquent % delinquent	51 38 74.5	69 50 72.5	88 62 70.5	47 33 70.2 ³
Food and Drugs Act	Total disposed Number delinquent % delinquent	14 10 71.4 ³	21 10 47.6 ³	26 17 65.4 ³	23 18 78.3 ³
Provincial liquor statutes ²	Total disposed Number delinquent % delinquent	1,269 1,000 78.8	1,378 1,097 79.6	1,207 874 72.4	1,195 851 71.2
ONTARIO TOTAL	Total disposed Number delinquent % delinquent	1,755 1,349 76.9	1,962 1,516 77.3	1,957 1,395 71.3	1,801 1,264 70.2

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics,
Juvenile Delinquents, 1978-81.

TABLE 22
Number and Percentage of Drug and Alcohol-Related Charges Resulting
in a Finding of Delinquency by Disposition and Type of Charge, 1978-81

DRUG AND ALCOHOL-RELATED CHARGES		TRAINING SCHOOL			
		1978	1979	1980	1981
NCA, possession	N	13	14	24	16
	%	4.3	3.9	5.4	4.4
NCA, other	N	0	4	6	2
	%	-	8.0	9.7	6.1 ³
Food and Drugs Act	N	1	3	1	2
	%	10.0 ³	30.0 ³	5.9 ³	11.1 ³
Provincial liquor statutes	N	53	43	45	26
	%	5.3	3.9	5.1	3.1
TOTAL	N	67	64	76	46
	%	5.0	4.2	5.4	3.6
		CAS			
NCA, possession	N	6	12	5	6
	%	2.0	3.3	1.1	1.7
NCA, other	N	1	2	4	0
	%	2.6 ³	4.0	6.5	-
Food and Drugs Act	N	1	0	1	3
	%	10.0 ³	-	5.9 ³	16.7 ³
Provincial liquor statutes	N	43	36	40	13
	%	4.3	3.3	4.6	1.5
TOTAL	N	51	50	50	22
	%	3.8	3.3	3.6	1.7
		PROBATION			
NCA, possession	N	139	146	181	166
	%	46.2	40.7	41.0	45.9
NCA, other	N	22	31	38	24
	%	57.9 ³	62.0	61.3	72.7 ³
Food and Drugs Act	N	5	3	11	10
	%	50.0 ³	30.0 ³	64.7 ³	55.6 ³
Provincial liquor statutes	N	385	412	327	287
	%	38.5	37.6	37.4	33.7
TOTAL	N	551	592	557	487
	%	40.8	39.1	39.9	38.5
		OTHER			
NCA, possession	N	143	187	232	174
	%	47.5	52.1	52.5	48.1
NCA, other	N	15	13	14	7
	%	39.5 ³	26.0	22.6	21.2 ³
Food and Drugs Act	N	3	4	4	3
	%	30.0 ³	40.0 ³	23.5 ³	16.7 ³
Provincial liquor statutes	N	519	606	462	525
	%	51.9	55.2	52.9	61.7
TOTAL	N	680	810	712	709
	%	50.4	53.4	51.0	56.1
ONTARIO GRAND TOTAL	N	1,349	1,516	1,395	1,254
	%	100	100	100	100

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Juvenile Delinquents, 1978-81.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLES 21, 22

1. Includes trafficking, importing and cultivating of drugs covered by the Narcotic Control Act (see footnote 4, page 9).
2. See footnote 7, page 9.
3. Percentage calculated on base figure of less than 50.

Discussion

Little is known about the role drugs, including alcohol, play in juveniles' involvement with crime, although the use of alcohol by juveniles and the non-medical use of narcotic, controlled and restricted drugs are in themselves offences.

The fact that a young person apprehended for an offence was under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time the offence was committed may or may not be detected by the arresting police officer. If it is detected, the information may or may not be recorded. And it might be even more difficult to learn from police records that a juvenile was believed to have committed a crime to obtain drugs or alcohol or the money to buy them. In any case, police records on juveniles are highly confidential.

If a drug or alcohol-related offence is alleged to have been committed along with another offence, only the most serious offence will be recorded for the purposes of Statistics Canada's crime enforcement statistics. Only the Metropolitan Toronto Police does not apply this "multiple offence rule" -- its reports to Statistics Canada include information on all offences detected in connection with a single incident or victim.

If all offences detected by police were reported to Statistics Canada, more might be known about the extent to which drugs and alcohol are involved when other crimes are committed.

Statistics Canada's aim is to record the nature and frequency of illegal incidents, rather than the total number of offences within incidents. And to a considerable extent, recording offences within incidents would provide more information about police charging practices than about crime. However, this would be interesting information in itself, and as long as all offences within a single incident or against a single victim were coded so they could be linked and the most serious selected, the statistics presently provided by Statistics Canada could still be produced.

The number of juveniles (including repeaters) apprehended by the police for drug and alcohol-related offences was described in Chapter 1. These data include only cases in which the drug or alcohol-related offence was the most serious the juvenile was alleged to have committed. (The Toronto police's failure to use the multiple offence rule does not affect the data on persons apprehended. For each person, only the most serious offence detected is recorded.)

While the police report only the most serious offences alleged to have been committed by the juveniles they apprehend, juvenile courts submit information on all charges disposed. Tables 21 and 22 show the adjudication and disposition of drug and alcohol-related charges. (The cautions in the previous chapter about the incompleteness of the reports submitted to Statistics Canada apply to these data.)

The average number of drug and alcohol-related charges disposed a year between 1978 and 1981 was: narcotics possession, 522; narcotics trafficking, importing and cultivating, 64; offences under the Food and Drugs Act, 21; and liquor-related offences, 1,262.

Of the average total of 1,869 drug and alcohol-related charges disposed a year, 1,381 (73.9%) ended in findings of delinquency. An average 63 (4.6%) of these resulted in committal to training school; 43 (3.1%) in Children's Aid Society placement; 547 (39.6%) in placement on probation; and 728 (52.7%) in other dispositions.

There were no marked trends over time, although the percentage of drug and alcohol-related charges ending in findings of delinquency declined from 76.9% in 1978 and 77.3% in 1979 to 71.3% in 1980 and 70.2% in 1981.

CHAPTER 4 :

CORRECTIONS STATISTICS

TABLE 23

Caseload in the Ontario Juvenile Correctional Services System
by Program/Facility, Dec. 31, 1980 and Dec. 31, 1981

PROGRAM/FACILITY		CASELOAD	
		DEC.31,1980	DEC.31,1981
Observation and detention homes ¹	N %	328 4.4	428 5.5
Probation	N %	4,608 61.9	5,099 65.3
Training school	N %	405 5.4	404 5.2
Correctional group home ²	N %	78 1.0	71 0.9
Other ³	N %	2,021 27.2	1,803 23.1
TOTAL ⁴	N	7,440	7,805

Source: Data provided by Management Information Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

TABLE 24

Number of Admissions to and Discharges from the Ontario Juvenile
Correctional Services System by Program/Facility, 1981

PROGRAM/FACILITY	MOVEMENTS DURING 1981 ⁵	
	ADMISSIONS	DISCHARGES
Observation and detention homes ¹	4,876	4,775
Probation	5,516	5,025
Training school	1,320	1,321
Correctional group home ²	128	135
Other ³	1,279	1,497
TOTAL ⁴	13,119	12,753

Source: Data provided by Management Information Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

TABLE 25

Number and Percentage of Discharges from Observation
and Detention Homes in 1981 by Length of Stay

LENGTH OF STAY	DISCHARGES FROM OBSERVATION AND DETENTION HOMES IN 1981	
	N	%
Less than 5 days	2,330	48.8
5 to 9 days	916	19.2
10 to 19 days	684	14.3
20 to 29 days	395	8.3
1 to 3 months	413	8.6
4 to 6 months	19	0.4
7 months or more	18	0.4
TOTAL	4,775	100

Source: Data provided by Management Information Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

TABLE 26

Number and Percentage of Discharges from Probation in 1981 by Length of Stay

LENGTH OF STAY	DISCHARGES FROM PROBATION IN 1981	
	N	%
Less than 4 months	1,067	21.2
4 to 6 months	1,493	29.7
7 to 9 months	750	14.9
10 months to 1 year	808	16.1
1 to 2 years	739	14.7
2 to 3 years	123	2.4
3 to 4 years	27	0.5
More than 4 years	18	0.4
TOTAL	5,025	100

Source: Data provided by Management Information Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

TABLE 27

Number and Percentage of Discharges from Training Schools,
Correctional Group Homes and Other Programs/Facilities by Length of Stay

LENGTH OF STAY	DISCHARGES IN 1981					
	TRAINING SCHOOL		CORRECTIONAL GROUP HOME		OTHER	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 1 month	419	31.7	40	29.6	200	13.4
1 to 3 months	489	37.0	43	31.9	236	15.8
4 to 6 months	289	21.9	21	15.6	172	11.5
7 to 9 months	91	6.9	18	13.3	157	10.5
10 months to 1 year	20	1.5	3	2.2	83	5.5
More than 1 year	13	1.0	10	7.4	649	43.4
TOTAL	1,321	100	135	100	1,497	100

Source: Data provided by Management Information Systems Branch,
Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

TABLE 28

Number and Percentage of Discharges in 1981 by Next Destination and Program/Facility from which Discharged

PROGRAM/FACILITY FROM WHICH DISCHARGED		NEXT DESTINATION									
		MINISTRY YOUTH RESI- DENTIAL FACILITY	MINISTRY YOUTH NON- RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM	JAIL/ ADULT FACILITY	OTHER RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	OTHER NON- RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM	COMMUNITY	AWOL ⁶	DEATH	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Observation and detention homes	N	2,668	448	60	82	57	1,338	80	1	41	4,775
	%	55.9	9.4	1.3	1.7	1.2	28.0	1.7	0.0	0.9	100
Probation	N	0	695	29	13	27	4,241	15	5	0	5,025
	%	-	13.8	0.6	0.3	0.5	84.4	0.3	0.1	-	100
Training school	N	558	429	29	61	2	80	162	0	0	1,321
	%	42.2	32.5	2.2	4.6	0.2	6.1	12.3	-	-	100
Correctional group home	N	50	18	2	3	2	35	25	0	0	135
	%	37.0	13.3	1.5	2.2	1.5	25.9	18.5	-	-	100
Other	N	159	356	47	16	47	610	260	2	0	1,497
	%	10.6	23.8	3.1	1.1	3.1	40.7	17.4	0.1	-	100
TOTAL	N	3,435	1,946	167	175	135	6,304	542	8	41	12,753
	%	26.9	15.3	1.3	1.4	1.1	49.4	4.2	0.1	0.3	100

Source: Data provided by Management Information Systems Branch, Ministry of Community and Social Services.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLES 23-28

1. Includes juveniles who may not subsequently be found delinquent or who, although found delinquent, may not come into further contact with the juvenile correctional services system because they receive dispositions other than probation or commitment to a training school.
2. Privately run homes totally subsidized by the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services and generally used exclusively for Crown wards.
3. Includes juveniles in boarding homes, children's mental health centres, maternity homes, etc., as well as juveniles living with their parents or on their own.
4. Juveniles committed to training school generally receive correctional aftercare services until the age of 18. Caseload totals include juveniles receiving aftercare services. A small number of juveniles may be counted twice in the caseload totals, e.g. training school runaways and probationers being held in observation and detention homes.
5. Each admission to and discharge from a correctional program/facility is included in the count. A single juvenile may have several admissions and discharges during the year -- the terms "admission" and "discharge" refer to admission to or discharge from a specified program/facility, not the juvenile correctional services system as a whole. Caseload figures at Dec. 31, 1980, plus admissions and minus discharges for 1981 should equal the Dec. 31, 1981, caseload figures. There is a discrepancy of one in the figures for observation and detention homes.
6. Absent without official leave for 48 hours or more.

Discussion

The juvenile correctional services system

Juveniles who are placed on probation or committed to training school fall under the purview of the juvenile correctional services system, administered by the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Probation may be for an indefinite or a specified term -- nothing in the Juvenile Delinquents Act requires a judge to set a term. A juvenile is discharged from probation by the judge who heard his case, either at the end of his term or on the recommendation of his probation officer.

Committal to training school means a juvenile is made a ward of the Crown and committed to the care of the province in accordance with the Training Schools Act (Revised Statutes of Ontario 1980, Chapter 508). The Ministry of Community and Social Services may place the juvenile in a training school, a correctional group home (a privately run, Ministry-subsidized facility generally used exclusively for Crown wards) or anywhere else it sees fit. Crown wardship expires when the ward reaches 18 years of age, although it may be ended by the Ministry before then. Until wardship ends, the juvenile receives aftercare services and remains part of the juvenile corrections caseload.

In addition to correctional services, the Ministry of Community and Social Services maintains observation and detention homes, where juveniles may be held prior to court appearance, pending trial or on the way to other facilities.

Caseload

Table 23 shows the juvenile corrections' caseload at Dec. 31, 1980, and Dec. 31, 1981, including juveniles held in observation and detention homes. At the end of 1980, 328 juveniles were being held in observation and detention homes; 4,608 were on probation; 405 were in training schools; 78 in correctional group homes; and 2,021 in other institutions and homes, with their parents, on their own, etc. (Included in the last category are Crown wards receiving aftercare services following discharge from other programs/facilities. At the end of 1981, the figures were: observation and detention homes, 428; probation, 5,099; training schools, 404; correctional group homes, 71; other, 1,803.

Movements and length of stay

Table 24 shows the movements within the juvenile corrections system in 1981 and Tables 25 to 27, the length of stay in the different programs/facilities.

Almost half of the discharges* from observation and

* The term "discharge" refers to discharge from a specified program/facility, not from the juvenile correctional services system as a whole.

detention homes in 1981 came after stays of less than 5 days and 82.3% came after stays of less than 20 days. About half of the discharges from probation came before 7 months had been served and 82.0% came before a year.

Looking at training schools, 31.7% of the 1981 discharges came after stays of less than a month; 37.0% came after stays of between 1 and 3 months and 21.9% after stays of 4 to 6 months. Only 9.4% of training school discharges came after stays of 7 months or more and only 1.0% after stays of more than a year. Similarly, 29.6% of discharges from correctional group homes came after stays of less than a month; 31.9% after 1 to 3 months; 15.6%, 4 to 6 months; and 23.0%, 7 months or more.

Length of stay in programs/facilities that fall into the category "other" follows a different pattern, with 59.4% of stays lasting 7 months or more. Also, this category includes Crown wards receiving aftercare services, whose total length of stay on aftercare may be made up of several stays in different programs/facilities which fall into this category.

Table 28 shows the next destination of discharges from observation and detention homes and correctional programs/facilities. While 84.4% of discharges from probation are into the community, three-quarters of training school discharges move to other Ministry of Community and Social Services facilities or

programs, as do half of correctional group home discharges.

Implications

Overall, juvenile correctional programs/facilities are characterized by high turnover and short stays. This suggests that drug/alcohol education programs designed for use in correctional settings should be short and intense.

Based on 1980 and 1981 figures, just more than 5% of the correctional services caseload consists of juveniles in training schools. While this is a relatively small percentage, assuming these youth are highly at risk of further trouble with the law, preventive drug/alcohol education in training schools should be considered. An alternative would be for them to attend such a program after discharge from training school, while receiving aftercare services.

Probationers and juveniles receiving aftercare services are a large majority of the correctional services caseload. As suggested in Chapter 2, programs run by or in conjunction with Probation and Aftercare offices could serve these youth and could also be made available to others on referral by judges or social service agencies.

Finally, a large number of juveniles pass through observation and detention homes. Although stays are very short and many of these youth go on to other correctional programs/facilities, programs in the large observation and detention

homes could serve some juveniles who would otherwise be overlooked. Particularly, an observation and detention home program might be the only opportunity for juveniles who are subsequently not found delinquent or who receive dispositions that do not bring them into contact with the correctional system to participate in a drug/alcohol education program designed for young people in trouble with the law. Also, programs run out of Probation and Aftercare offices would probably be available to selected juveniles only, at least initially.

CHAPTER 5:

CONCLUSIONS

Findings

Further research is needed on the link between drug/alcohol use and juvenile crime. If the link were found to be causal, the case for preventive drug education among juveniles in trouble with the law would be much stronger. But even without evidence of a causal link, a persuasive argument can be made.

Drug use and delinquency have been consistently shown to be correlated. Since drug use is more frequent in delinquent populations, education programs aimed at these populations will reach a higher proportion of users. Furthermore, drug/alcohol use is one of many behaviors that, directly or indirectly, get juveniles into trouble. Effective educational programs should be able to help alleviate at least this source of potential problems and, since drug/alcohol use is itself illegal, could prevent some young offenders from coming into further contact with the law. There is, in addition, the likelihood that such programs could also benefit those who have not yet experienced problems with the law. In the past, drug education with school populations has been shown to be of mixed effectiveness in preventing drug use. Programs developed and tested with young offenders could be useful in developing programs that are more effective in reaching and influencing those parts of school populations characterized by high rates of drug use and other problem behaviors, in other words, those for whom programs may

be considered essential.

In Ontario, an average of about 66,400 suspected juvenile offenders (including repeaters) were apprehended by the police each year between 1978 and 1981. Of these, approximately 20,600 were charged.

Looking at figures for 1980-81 and 1981-82, of more than 20,000 juvenile court cases completed each year, about 16,500 resulted in findings of delinquency. (This figure includes cases adjourned without a finding of delinquency.) About 5,700 cases led to probation and 800 to training school. The remaining 10,000 cases led to dispositions that would not entail involvement with the juvenile correctional services system.

Probationers and juveniles receiving aftercare services are a large majority of the correctional services caseload. For them, as well as for other juvenile offenders living in the community, educational programs could be run out of Probation and Aftercare offices. Short programs in the larger observation and detention homes could reach a large number of juveniles, including some who might not have another chance to participate in such a program. Finally, although a relatively small number of juveniles go to training schools, assuming they are highly at risk of further trouble with the law, drug/alcohol education programs should be considered for young offenders in these institutions.

Recommendations

As a result of the findings above, the following research recommendations are made:

1. The development and research-testing of pilot education programs for use in observation and detention homes, training schools and/or non-residential juvenile correctional settings (e.g., Probation and Aftercare offices). The objectives of this activity will include:
 - (a) The identification of effective ways to influence the behaviors (including drug use) of juveniles who have encountered problems with the justice system;
 - (b) The identification of the psycho-social dynamics of such effective interventions identified in (a);
 - (c) The identification of effective procedures for reaching and influencing those youth who are still only "at risk" of developing problems involving the justice system, and who are still in the regular school system.
2. A review of the literature on:
 - (a) Drug/alcohol education programs for juveniles who have encountered trouble with the law;
 - (b) The causes and nature of delinquency, particularly as these relate to drug use and abuse.

The objectives of these activities are to provide the theoretical and conceptual bases for the development and evaluation of the programs referred to in (1) above.

